



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/666,398	09/20/2000	Paul A. P. Kaufholz	PHN 17-643 8968		
7.	590 03/19/2003				
Corporate Patent Counsel US Philips Corporation 580 White Plains Road			EXAMINER		
			STORM, DONALD L		
Tarrytown, NY	10591		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2654	/2	
			DATE MAILED: 03/19/2003	03	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

99

			. 9/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/666,398	KAUFHOLZ, PAUL A. P.	
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donald L. Storm	2654	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment which	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set f	under forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b) M they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	below);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	• •	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amend	ment
5.☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	r
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 6-11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	asta	
10. Other:	MARSHA D. BANKS-rii-	BG.	
	SUPERVISORY PATENT E) TECHNOLOGY CENTER	CAMINER	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Additional search would be required because of the new claim limitations of (1) two audio source signals (that are to be canceled) being within a proximity of the sensitivity range of the microphone and (2) the two audio source signals contributing to the input to the microphone. Patentability in view of combinations of references already of record must also be reconsidered, and sufficiency of disclosure as originally filed would require reconsideration.

Reconsideration is also required of whether all dependent claims now distinctly claim the invention in light of the new claim limitations.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's argument concerning low-volume sounds picked up by the microphone is directed to subject matter that has not been entered.

The Applicant's argument about degrading speech desired to be recognized because of removing someone else's speech as background noise is newly presented. Good and sufficient reasons have not been shown as to why this was not presented earlier before prosecution was closed and in response to the Office action in which the rejections first appeared. A reply to the newly raised issue requires further consideration and may require additional search.